REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1-6, 8-17, and 22-26 are pending. Claims 8 and 23 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 6 and 22 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 8 and 23, respectively. Claims 9, 11, 14 and 16 have been amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been added.

Objection

The Examiner objected to claims 6 and 8-10 due to minor informalities. Applicants have amended claims 6 and 9 accordingly. Claim 8 has been canceled. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,612 of Zhu, et al. ("Zhu"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0091037 of Latif, et al. ("Latif") and U.S. Patent No. 6,625,747 Tawil, et al. ("Tawil"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As the Examiner acknowledged, neither Zhu nor Latif discloses or suggests "assigning a common name to a pair of ports, *wherein each port in the pair of ports is located on first and second FC node devices, respectively,* and *the pair of ports includes a source port and a destination port* ..." as recited in claim 1.

Tawil does not disclose or suggest the assigning operation of claim 1 either. To support failover in a storage system, Tawil discloses the host sever 50 is associated with two controllers 64 & 68. However, the port names of the two controllers 64 and 68 are

different; one is "A," and the other is "B," as shown in Figure 2 of Tawil. By contrast, a *common* (i.e., same) name is assigned to a pair of *ports* in claim 1.

Moreover, in claim 1, *each* of the pair of ports belongs to a *different* FC *node* device. To the contrary, the two controllers 64 and 68 of Tawil belong to a *single* node 62. Indeed, the two controllers 64 and 68 are assigned the same *node* name, "X."

Furthermore, the pair of ports of claim 1 is a source and destination pair, *i.e.*, "the pair of ports includes a source port and a destination port." In contrast, the two controllers 64 and 68 of Tawil cannot be a source and destination pair. In Tawil, the two controllers 64 and 68 are provided at the *same* node for taking over the work of the other when the other fails, and thus, both should be either a source or destination and cannot have different functions.

Thus, Tawil cannot be properly interpreted as teaching or suggesting "assigning a common name to a pair of ports, wherein each port in the pair of ports is located on first and second FC node devices, respectively, and the pair of ports includes a source port and a destination port" as recited in claim 1.

In addition, because Tawil fails to teach or suggest assigning a common name to a pair of ports as discussed above, Tawil also fails to teach or suggest "storing *the common name-to-port assignment* within a name server for the FC fabric," and "configuring the first FC node device to query the name server to obtain an identity for the port located on the second FC node device *based on the common name*, and configuring the second FC node device to query the name server to obtain an identity for the port located on the first FC node device *based on the common name*" as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, a combination of Zhu, Latif and Tawil does not disclose or suggest the method of claim 1, and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zhu, Latif and Tawil.

Claims 2-5 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Thus, claims 2-5 include the limitations set forth in claim 1. Therefore, at least for the reason discussed above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 6, 22, and 24-26

The Examiner rejected independent claims 6, 22 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zhu and Latif.

Claim 6, as amended, includes "... each symbolic name is a combination of a plurality of attributes of a corresponding FC port, *and the plurality of attributes are selected from the group consisting of a port type, a slot number for each FC port, and a sub-slot number for each FC port ....*"

The Examiner acknowledged that neither Zhu nor Latif discloses or suggests "... the plurality of attributes are selected from the group consisting of a port type, a slot number for each port, and a sub-slot number for each port ..." as recited in amended claim 6. Instead, in this rejection of claims 8 and 23, the Examiner asserts U.S. Patent No. 7,230,929 of Betker, et al. ("Betker") discloses this claimed element.

Applicants respectfully submit that Betker qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based it was published after Applicants' effective filing data. Applicants do not admit that Betker is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date.

Betker discloses a multi-module Fibre Channel *switch* that uses multiple *blades* as shown in Figure 2. However, neither the multi-module FC *switch* nor each *blade* of

Betker is a FC *port* of a FC node device in a fabric. Thus, the slot number of Betker is not equivalent to the slot number of claim 6 because one of skilled in the art would not consider a *blade in the multi-module FC switch* to be equivalent to a FC *port* of a FC *node device* as claimed by Applicants.

Thus, a combination of Zhu, Latif and Betker does not disclose or suggest the method of claim 6, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is allowable over Zhu, Latif and Betker.

Independent claim 22 contains similar limitations as claim 6. Therefore, at least for the reason stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is allowable over Zhu, Latif and Betker.

Claims 9-10 and 24-26 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 6 and 22, respectively, and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim. Therefore, at least for the reason discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-10 and 24-26 are allowable over Zhu, Latif and Betker.

Claims 11-12 and 14-17

The Examiner rejected claims 11-12 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zhu, Latif and U.S. Patent No. 7,042,877 of Foster, et al. ("Foster").

Applicants respectfully submit that Foster qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based it was published after Applicants' effective filing data. Applicants do not admit that Foster is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date.

The Examiner acknowledged that neither Zhu nor Latif disclose or suggest "*querying* a name server for the FC fabric *to obtain a FC identity for the second port, based on a match of a symbolic name of the first FC port and a symbolic name of the second FC port* ..." as recited in claim 11, and is relying on Foster as doing so.

Foster discloses a multi-protocol edge switch ("MPEX") 120 interfacing different networks to forward a data frame received from one network to another network as shown in Figure 1. Multiple Interconnect Modules (IFM) switches 110, which are connected to the MPEX 120, are intermediate routing devices *within a FC fabric* 110.

The sections of Foster cited by the Examiner describe the routing operation of the IFM switches 110 for a frame between *inter-domains within the FC fabric* 110 based on a match of the domain addresses using a virtual identifier table, which is very similar to the functionality of a router with IP addresses in the Internet. No one skilled in the art would consider this routing operation of the IFM switches 110 to be equivalent to "querying a name server for the FC fabric *to obtain a FC identity for the second port, based on a match of a symbolic name of the first FC port and a symbolic name of the second FC port* ..." of claim 11. Thus, Foster cannot be properly interpreted as teaching or suggesting such limitations of claim 11.

Thus, a combination of Foster, Zhu and Latif does not teach or suggest "querying a name server for the FC fabric to obtain a FC identity for the second port, based on a match of a symbolic name of the first FC port and a symbolic name of the second FC port ...," and "creating the link from the first FC port to the second FC port using the obtained FC identity for the second FC port." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zhu, Latif and Foster has been overcome.

Independent claims 14 and 16 contain similar limitations as claim 11. Therefore, at least for the reason stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14 and 16 are allowable over Zhu, Latif and Foster.

Claims 12-13, 15 and 17 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 11, 14 and 16, respectively, and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim.

Therefore, at least for the reason discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-13, 15 and 17 are allowable over Zhu, Latif and Foster.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 30, 2008

Sheryl Sue Holloway
Reg. No. 37,850

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94805-4040
(408) 720-8300